arXiv:1601.03438v1 [math.RA] 13 Jan 2016

Modules with ascending chain condition on annihilators and Goldie modules

Jaime Castro Pérez
Escuela de Ingeniería y Ciencias
Instituto Tecnológico y de Estudios Superiores de Monterrey
Calle del Puente 222, Tlalpan
14380 México, D.F.
México

Mauricio Medina Bárcenas and José Ríos Montes
Instituto de Matemáticas
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México
Area de la Investigación Científica
Circuito Exterior, C.U.
04510 México, D.F.
México

Abstract

Using the concepts of prime module, semiprime module and the concept of ascending chain condition (ACC) on annihilators for an R-module M . We prove that if M is semiprime and projective in $\sigma[M]$, such that M satisfies ACC on annihilators, then M has finitely many minimal prime submodules. Moreover if each submodule $N \subseteq M$ contains a uniform submodule, we prove that there is a bijective correspondence between a complete set of representatives of isomorphism classes of indecomposable non M-singular injective modules in $\sigma[M]$ and the set of minimal primes in M. If M is Goldie module then $\widehat{M} \cong E_1^{k_1} \oplus E_2^{k_2} \oplus ... \oplus E_n^{k_n}$ where each E_i is a uniform M-injective module. As an application, new characterizations of left Goldie rings are obtained.

Key Words: Prime modules; Semiprime modules; Goldie Modules; Indecomposable Modules; Torsion Theory

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 16S90; 16D50; 16P50; 16P70

Introduction

The Rings with ascending chain condition (ACC) on annihilators has been studied by several authors. For non commutative semiprime rings A.W. Chatters and C. R. Hjarnavis in [6] showed that if R is semiprime ring such that R satisfies ACC on annihilator ideals, then R has finitely many minimal prime ideals. K.R. Goodearl and R. B. Warfield in [8] showed that if R is a semiprime right Goldie ring, then R has finitely many minimal prime ideals.

In this paper we work in a more general situation, using the concept of prime and semiprime submodules defined in [11], [13] and the concept of ascending chain condition (ACC) on annihilators for a R-module M defined in [4], we show that if M is projective in $\sigma[M]$ and semiprime module, such that M satisfies ACC on annihilators, then M has finitely many minimal prime submodules in M. Moreover if each submodule $N \subseteq M$ contains a uniform submodule, we prove that there is a bijective correspondence between a complete set of isomorphism classes of indecomposable non M-singular injective modules in $\sigma[M]$ $\mathcal{E}_{\chi(M)}(M)$ and the set of minimal prime in M submodules $Spec^{Min}(M)$. Also we prove that there is a bijective correspondence between sets $\mathcal{E}_{\chi(M)}(M)$ and P_M^{Min}, where $P_M^{Min} = \{\chi(M/P) \mid P \subseteq M \text{ is a minimal prime in } M\}$. So we obtain new information about semiprime rings with ACC on annihilators. As an application, of these results we obtain a new characterization of Goldie Rings in terms of the of minimal prime idelas of R and a new characterization of these Rings in terms of the continuous modules with ACC on annihilators.

In order to do this, we organized the article in three sections. Section 1, we give some results about prime and semiprime modules and we define the concept right annihilator for a submodule N of M. In particular we prove in Proposition 1.16, that if M is projective in $\sigma[M]$ and M is semiprime module, then $Ann_M(N) = Ann_M^r(N)$ for all $N \subseteq M$. In Section 2, we define the concept of ascending chain condition (ACC) on annihilators for an R-module

M and we give the main result of this paper Theorem 2.2, we prove that if M is a semiprie module projective in $\sigma[M]$ and M satisfies ACC on annihilators, then M has finitely many minimal prime submodules in M. Moreover if P_1, $P_2, ..., P_n$ are the minimal prime in M submodules, then $P_1 \cap P_2 \cap ... \cap P_n = 0$. In Theorem 2.7, we show that there is a bijective correspondence between sets $\mathcal{E}_{\chi(M)}(M)$ and $Spec^{Min}(M)$. Moreover in Corollary 2.13 we obtain an application for semiprime rings. We prove that if R is a semiprime ring such R satisfies ACC on left annihilator and each $0 \neq I \subseteq R$ left ideal of R, contains a uniform left ideal of R, then there is a bijective correspondence between the set of representatives of isomorphism classes of indecomposable non singular injective R-modules and the set of minimal prime ideals of R. In particular in Corollary 2.15 we show, that for R a semiprime left Goldie ring the bijective correspondence above mentioned is true. Moreover in this Corollary we show that R has local Gabriel correspondence with respect to $\chi(R) = \tau_g$. Other important results are the Theorem 2.18 and 2.20. In the first Theorem we show that, if M satisfies ACC on annihilators and for each $0 \neq N \subseteq M$, N contains a uniform submodule, then $\widehat{M} = \widehat{N_1} \oplus \widehat{N_2} \oplus ... \oplus \widehat{N_n}$ where $N_i = Ann_M^r(P_i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. And in the second Theorem we prove that if M

is semiprime Goldie module, then there are E_1, E_2, ..., E_n uniform injective modules such that $\widehat{M} \cong E_1^{k_1} \oplus E_2^{k_2} \oplus ... \oplus E_n^{k_n}$ and $Ass_M(E_i) = \{P_i\}$. As other application of these results we give the Theorem 2.27, where we prove that if R is a semiprime ring, such that R satisfies ACC on left annihilators and for each non zero left ideal $I \subseteq R$, I contains a uniform left ideal, then the following conditions are equivalents: *i)* R is left Goldie ring, *ii)* P_i has finite uniform dimension for each $1 \leq i \leq n$. In the Section 3 we use the concept of continuous module and we show in the Theorem 3.6 that if M is continuous, retractable, non M-singular module and M satisfies ACC on annihilators, then M is a semiprime Goldie module. Finally as one more application we obtain the Corollary 3.7, where we show that, if R is a continuous, non singular ring and R satisfies ACC on left annihilators, then R is semiprime left Goldie ring.

In what follows, R will denote an associative ring with unity and R-Mod will denote the category of unitary left R-modules. Let M and X be R-modules. X is said to be M-generated if there exists an R-epimorphism from a direct sum

of copies of M onto X. The category $\sigma[M]$ is defined as the full subcategory of R-Mod containing all R-modules X which are isomorphic to a submodule of an M-generated module.

Let M-$tors$ be the frame of all hereditary torsion theories on $\sigma[M]$. For a family $\{M_\alpha\}$ of left R-modules in $\sigma[M]$, let $\chi(\{M_\alpha\})$ be the greatest element of M-$tors$ for which all the M_α are torsion free, and let $\xi(\{M_\alpha\})$ denote the least element of M-$tors$ for which all the M_α are torsion. $\chi(\{M_\alpha\})$ is called the torsion theory cogenerated by the family $\{M_\alpha\}$, and $\xi(\{M_\alpha\})$ is the torsion theory generated by the family $\{M_\alpha\}$. In particular, the greatest element of M-$tors$ is denoted by χ and the least element of M-$tors$ is denoted by ξ. If τ is an element of M-$tors$, $gen(\tau)$ denotes the interval $[\tau, \chi]$.

Let $\tau \in M$-$tors$. By $\mathbb{T}_\tau, \mathbb{F}_\tau, t_\tau$ we denote the torsion class, the torsion free class and the torsion functor associated to τ, respectively. For $N \in \sigma[M]$, N is called τ-cocritical if $N \in \mathbb{F}_\tau$ and for all $0 \neq N' \subseteq N$, $N/N' \in \mathbb{T}_\tau$. We say that N is cocritical if N is τ-cocritical for some $\tau \in M$-$tors$. If N is an essential submodule of M, we write $N \subseteq_{ess} M$. If N is a fully invariant submodule of M we write $N \subseteq_{FI} M$. For $\tau \in M$-tors and $M' \in \sigma[M]$, a submodule N of M' is τ-pure in M' if $M'/N \in \mathbb{F}_\tau$.

A module $N \in \sigma[M]$ is called singular in $\sigma[M]$, or M-singular, if there is an exact sequence in $\sigma[M]$ $\ 0 \to K \to L \to N \to 0$, with K essential in L. The class $\mathcal{S}$ of all M-singular modules in $\sigma[M]$ is closed by taking submodules, factor modules and direct sums. Therefore, any $L \in \sigma[M]$ has a largest M-singular submodule $\mathcal{Z}(L) = \sum \{f(N) \mid N \in \mathcal{S} \text{ and } f \in Hom_R(N, L)\}$. L is called non M-singular if $\mathcal{Z}(L) = 0$. If N is a fully invarint submodule of M, we write $N \subseteq_{FI} M$.

Injective modules and injective hulls exist in $\sigma[M]$, since injective hull of X in $\sigma[M]$ is $\widehat{X} = tr^M(E(X)) = \sum_{f \in Hom_R(M, E(X))} f(M)$, where $E(X)$ denotes the injective hull of X in R-Mod.

Let $M \in R$-Mod. In [**1,** Definition 1.1] the annihilator in M of a class $\mathcal{C}$ of R-modules is defined as $Ann_M(\mathcal{C}) = \bigcap_{K \in \Omega} K$, where

$\Omega = \{K \subseteq M \mid \text{there exists } W \in \mathcal{C} \text{ and } f \in Hom_R(M, W) \text{ with } K = \ker f\}$. Also in [1, Definition 1.5] a product is defined in the following way. Let N be

a submodule of M. For each module $X \in R\text{-}Mod$, $N \cdot X = Ann_X(\mathcal{C})$, where $\mathcal{C}$ is the class of modules W, such that $f(N) = 0$ for all $f \in Hom_R(M, W)$. For $M \in R\text{-}Mod$ and K, L submodules of M, in [2] is defined the product $K_M L$ as $K_M L = \sum \{f(K) \mid f \in Hom_R(M, L)\}$. We in [3,Proposition 1.9] that if $M \in R$-Mod and $\mathcal{C}$ be a class of left R-modules, then $Ann_M(\mathcal{C}) = \sum \{N \subset M \mid N_M X = 0 \text{ for all } X \in \mathcal{C}\}$.

Moreover Beachy showed in [1, Proposition 5.5] that, if M is projective in $\sigma[M]$ and N is a any submodule of M, then $N \cdot X = N_M X$, for any R-module $X \in \sigma[M]$.

Let $M \in R\text{-}Mod$ and $N \neq M$ a fully invariant submodule of M, N is prime in M if for any K, L fully invariant submodules of M we have that $K_M L \subseteq N$ implies that $K \subseteq N$ or $L \subseteq N$. We say that M is a prime module if 0 is prime in M see [11, Definition 13 and Definition 16].

For $N \in \sigma[M]$, a proper fully invariant submodule K of M is said to be associated to N, if there exists a non-zero submodule L of N such that $Ann_M(L') = K$ for all non-zero submodules L' of L. By [3, Proposition 1.16] we have that K is prime in M. We denote by $Ass_M(N)$ the set of all submodules prime in M associated to N. Also note that, if N is a uniform module, then $Ass_M(N)$ has at most one element.

A module M is retractable if $Hom_R(M, N) \neq 0$ for all $0 \neq N \subseteq M$.

For details about concepts and terminology concerning torsion theories in $\sigma[M]$, see [16] and [17].

1 Preliminaries

The following definition was given in [4, Definition 3.2] we include it for the convenience of the reader.

Definition 1.1. Let $M \in R$-Mod and $N \neq M$ a fully invariant submodule of M. We say that N is semiprime in M if for any $K \subseteq_{FI} M$ such that $K_M K \subseteq N$, then $K \subseteq N$. We say M is semiprime if 0 is semiprime in M.

Remark 1.2. Notice that if M is projective in $\sigma[M]$ and $N \subseteq_{FI} M$, then by [4, Remark 3.3], N is semiprime in M if and only if for any submodule K of M such that $K_M K \subseteq N$ we have that $K \subseteq N$. Analogously by [4 Remark 3.22] we have that if $P \subseteq_{FI} M$, then P is prime in M if and only if for any K, L submodules of M such that $K_M L \subseteq P$ we have that $K \subseteq P$ or $L \subseteq P$.

Proposition 1.3. Let $M \in R$-Mod be projective in $\sigma[M]$. If $N \subseteq_{FI} M$, then the following conditions are equivalent

i) N is semiprime in M

ii) For any submodule K of M such that $N \subseteq K$ and $K_M K \subseteq N$, then $K = N$.

Proof. *i*) $\Rightarrow$ *ii*) It is clear by Remark 1.2.

ii) $\Rightarrow$ *i*) Let $K \subseteq M$ a submodule such that $K_M K \subseteq N$. We claim that $(K+N)_M K \subseteq N$ and $K_M(K+N) \subseteq N$. In fact by [3, Proposition 1.3] we have that $(K+N)_M K = K_M K + N_M K$. As N is a fully invariant submodule of M, then $N_M K \subseteq N$. Thus $(K+N)_M K \subseteq N$. Now as $K_M K \subseteq N$, then $K_M K \subseteq N \cap K$. So by [1, Proposition 5.5] we have that $K_M\left(\frac{K}{N \cap K}\right) = 0$. Hence $K_M\left(\frac{K+N}{N}\right) = 0$. Newly by [**1,** Proposition 5.5] $K_M(K+N) \subseteq N$. Hence by [3, Proposition 1.3] we have that $(K+N)_M(K+N) = K_M(K+N) + N_M(K+N) \subseteq N$. By hypothesis we have that $(K+N) = N$. Thus $K = N$.

Remark 1.4. Let $M \in R$-Mod be projective in $\sigma[M]$. Similarly to the proof of Proposition 1.3, we can prove that a fully invariant submodule P of M is prime in M if and only if for any submodules K and L of M containing P, such that $K_M L \subseteq P$, then $K = P$ or $L = P$.

The following definition was given in [4, Definition 3.2], and we include it here for the convenience of the reader.

Definition 1.5. Let $M \in R$- Mod. If N is a submodule of M, then successive powers of N are defined as follows: First, $N^2 = N_M N$. Then by induction, for any integer $k > 2$, we define $N^k = N_M\left(N^{k-1}\right)$.

Notice that in general is false that $N_M\left(N^{k-1}\right) = \left(N^{k-1}\right)_M N$. In the Example 2.8 (1) we can see this.

Lemma 1.6. Let $M \in R$-Mod be projective in $\sigma[M]$ and $N \subseteq M$ semiprime in M submodule. If J is a submodule of M such that $J^n \subseteq N$ for some positive positive integer n, then $J \subseteq N$.

Proof. In case $n = 1$, there is nothing to prove. Now let $n > 1$ and assume the Lemma holds for lower powers. Since $n \geq 2$, then $2n - 2 \geq n$. Hence $J^{2n-2} \subseteq J^n$. Now by [1, Proposition 5.6] we have that $\left(J^{n-1}\right)^2 = J^{2n-2} \subseteq N$. Thus by Remark 1.2 we have that $J^{n-1} \subseteq N$. So by the induction hypothesis we have that $J \subseteq N$.

Lemma 1.7. Let $M \in R$-Mod be projective in $\sigma[M]$ and semiprime module . If N and L are submodules of M such that $N_M L = 0$, then

i) $L_M N = 0$

ii) $N \cap L = 0$

Proof. *i)* Since M is projective in $\sigma[M]$, then by [1 Proposition 5.6] we have that $(L_M N)_M (L_M N) = L_M (N_M L)_M N = 0$. As M is semiprime and by Remark 1.2, then $L_M N = 0$.

ii) By [3, Proposition 1.3] we have that $(N \cap L)_M (N \cap L) \subseteq N_M L = 0$. Newly as M is semiprime, then $N \cap L = 0$.

Remark 1.8. Let $M \in R$-Mod be projective in $\sigma[M]$ and a semiprime module, then we claim that $L \cap Ann_M(L) = 0$ for all L submodule of M. In fact, if $K = L \cap Ann_M(L)$, then by [3, Proposition 1.3] we have that $K_M K \subseteq Ann_M(L)_M L = 0$. Since M is semiprime, then $K = 0$. Moreover we claim that $L \cap L' \neq 0$ for all $L' \subseteq_{FI} M$ such that $Ann_M(L) \subsetneq L'$. In fact, let $L' \subseteq_{FI} M$ be such that $Ann_M(L) \subsetneq L'$. Suppose that $L \cap L' = 0$, then $L'_M L \subseteq L' \cap L = 0$. Hence $L' \subseteq Ann_M(L)$. So $Ann_M(L) = L'$ a contradiction.

Proposition 1.9. Let $M \in R$-Mod be projective in $\sigma[M]$ and a semiprime module, then $Hom_R(M, N) \neq 0$ for all $0 \neq N \subseteq M$.

Proof. Suppose that $Hom_R(M,N)=0$. Since $Ann_M(N)=$

$\cap\{\ker f \mid f\in Hom_R(M,N)\}$, then $Ann_M(N)=M$. Hence $M_MN=0$. Now by Lemma 1.7 we have that $N_MM=0$. As $N_MM=\sum_{f\in End_R(M)} f(M)$, then $N\subseteq N_MM$. So $N=0$ a contradiction.

Notice that if M is as in Proposition 1.9, then $Ann_M(N)=M$ if and only if $Hom_R(M,N)=0$ if and only if $N=0$. Therefore $Ann_M(N)\neq M$ for all $0\neq N\subseteq M$.

Proposition 1.10. Let $M\in R$-Mod and $\tau\in M$-tors. If P is a prime in M and P is τ-pure submodule of M, then there exists $P'\subseteq P$ such that P' is τ-pure and minimal prime in M.

Proof.Let $\mathcal{X}=\{Q\in M \mid Q\subseteq P$ and Q is τ-pure and prime in $M\ \}$. Since $P\in\mathcal{X}$, then $\mathcal{X}\neq\emptyset$. We claim that any chain $\mathcal{Y}\subseteq\mathcal{X}$, has a lower bound in $\mathcal{X}$. In fact, let $\mathcal{Y}=\{Q_i\}$ a descending chain chain in $\mathcal{X}$. Let $Q=\cap\mathcal{Y}$ is clear that Q is fully invariant submodule of M and $Q\subseteq P$. Since each Q_i is τ-pure in M, then Q is τ-pure in M. Now K and L be fully invariant submodule of M such that $K_ML\subseteq Q$. If $L\nsubseteq Q$, then there exists $Q_t\in\mathcal{Y}$ such that $L\nsubseteq Q_t$. Hence $L\nsubseteq Q_l$ for all $Q_l\subseteq Q_t$. Thus $K\subseteq Q_l$ for all $Q_l\subseteq Q_t$. As $\mathcal{Y}$ is a descending chain, then $K\subseteq Q$. Therefore by Zorn's Lemma $\mathcal{X}$ has minimal elements.

Proposition 1.11. Let $M\in R$-Mod be projective in $\sigma[M]$, semiprime module and $\tau\in M$-tors. If $U\subseteq M$ is a uniform submodule, such that $U\in\mathbb{F}_\tau$, then $Ann_M(U)$ is τ-pure and prime in M.

Proof. By Proposition 1.9 we have that $Ann_M(U)\subsetneq M$. Now we claim that $Ann_M(U)=Ann_M(U')$ for all $0\neq U'\subseteq U$. In fact let $0\neq U'\subseteq U$, then $Ann_M(U)\subseteq Ann_M(U')$. Suppose that $Ann_M(U)\subsetneq Ann_M(U')$. By [3, Proposition 1.9] we have that $Ann_M(U')$ is a fully invariant submodule of M. Now by Remark 1.8 we have that $U\cap Ann_M(U')\neq 0$. As U is uniform module, then $[U\cap Ann_M(U')]\cap U'\neq 0$. But by Remark 1.8 we have that $Ann_M(U')\cap U'=0$. So $[U\cap Ann_M(U')]\cap U'=0$ a contradiction. Therefore

$Ann_M(U) = Ann_M(U')$. Now by [3, Lemma 1.16] $Ann_M(U)$ is prime in M. On the other hand we know that $Ann_M(U) = \cap\{\ker f \mid f \in Hom_R(M,U)\}$. Since $U \in \mathbb{F}_\tau$, $\ker f$ is τ-pure in M. Hence $Ann_M(U)$ is τ-pure in M.

Remark 1.12. Let M be as in the Proposition 1.11 and $U \subseteq M$ uniform submodule, then $Ann_M(U) = Ann_M(U') = P$ for all $0 \neq U' \subseteq U$, where P is prime in M. So by [3, Definition 4.3] we have that $Ass_M(U) = \{P\}$. Moreover by [3, Proposition 4.4] we have that $Ass_M(U') = Ass_M(U) = \{P\}$ for all $0 \neq U' \subseteq U$.

Lemma 1.13. Let $M \in R$-Mod be projective in $\sigma[M]$ and semiprime module. Suppose that N is a submodule of M such that $P = Ann_M(N)$ is prime in M, then P is minimal prime in M.

Proof. By Proposition 1.10, there exists P' a minimal prime in M such that $P' \subseteq P$. As $[Ann_M(N)]_M N = 0 \subseteq P'$, then $N \subseteq P'$ or $Ann_M(N) \subseteq P'$. If $N \subseteq P'$, then $N \subseteq P = Ann_M(N)$. Thus $N_M N = 0$. Since M is semiprime module, then $N = 0$. Hence $P = Ann_M(N) = Ann_M(0) = M$, it is not possible. So the only possibility is $P = Ann_M(N) \subseteq P'$. Therefore $P = P'$ and we have the result.

Note that if M is as in the Lemma 1.13 and U is a uniform submodule of M, then by Proposition 1.11 we have that $P = Ann_M(U)$ is a prime in M submodule. Now by Lemma 1.13 we obtain that $P = Ann_M(U)$ is minimal prime in M. Moreover by proof of the Proposition 1.11 we have that $P = Ann_M(U) = Ann_M\left(\widehat{U}\right)$.

Definition 1.14. Let $M \in R$-Mod be projective in $\sigma[M]$. If N is a submodule of M, the right annihilator of N in M is $Ann^r_M(N) = \sum\{L \subseteq M \mid N_M L = 0\}$.

Note that $Ann^r_M(N)$ is the largest submodule of M such that

$N_M[Ann^r_M(N)] = 0$. In fact, if L and K are submodules of M such that $N_M L = 0$ and $N_M K = 0$, then by [3, Proposition 1.3] we have that

$N_M(L \oplus K) = 0$. Now since M is projective in $\sigma[M]$ then by [1, Proposition 5.5] $N_M\left(\frac{L \oplus K}{T}\right) = 0$ for all $T \subseteq L \oplus K$. So $N_M(L + K) = 0$.

Remark 1.15. If M is an R-module projective in $\sigma[M]$ and N and L are submodules of M such that $N_M L = 0$, then we claim that $N_M(L_M M) = 0$. In fact by [1, Proposition 5.6] we have that $N_M(L_M M) = (N_M L)_M M = 0$. Since $L \subseteq L_M M$ and $L_M M$ is a fully invariant submodule of M, then $Ann^r_M(N) = \sum\{L \subseteq_{FI} M \mid N_M L = 0\}$. Hence $Ann^r_M(N)$ is a fully invariant submodule of M.

Proposition 1.16. Let $M \in R$-Mod be projective in $\sigma[M]$. If M is a semiprime module, then $Ann_M(N) = Ann^r_M(N)$ for all $N \subseteq M$.

Proof. Since $Ann_M(N)_M N = 0$, then by Lemma 1.7, $N_M Ann_M(N) = 0$. So $Ann_M(N) \subseteq Ann^r_M(N)$. Newly as $N_M Ann^r_M(N) = 0$, then

$Ann^r_M(N)_M N = 0$. Thus $Ann^r_M(N) \subseteq Ann_M(N)$ Hence $Ann_M(N) = Ann^r_M(N)$.

Definition 1.17. Let $M \in R$-Mod. A submodule N of M is named annihilator submodule, if $N = Ann_M(K)$ for some $K \subseteq M$.

Notice that if N is an annihilator submodule, then N is a fully invariant submodule of M.

Proposition 1.18. Let $M \in R$-Mod be projective in $\sigma[M]$. If M is a semiprime module, then $Ann_M(Ann_M(N)) = Ann^r_M(Ann^r_M(N)) = N$ for all N annihilator submodule of M.

Proof. As $N_M Ann^r_M(N) = 0$, then by Lemma 1.7 we have that

$Ann^r_M(N)_M N = 0$. Thus $N \subseteq Ann^r_M(Ann^r_M(N))$. Since $N = Ann(K)$ for some submodule of M, then $N_M K = 0$. Hence $K \subseteq Ann^r_M(N)$. Therefore $Ann^r_M(Ann^r_M(N)) \subseteq Ann^r_M(K)$. So by Proposition 1.16 we have that

$Ann^r_M(Ann^r_M(N)) \subseteq Ann_M(K) = N$. Hence $Ann^r_M(Ann^r_M(N)) = N$. Moreover by Proposition 1.16 we have that

$Ann_M(Ann_M(N)) = Ann^r_M(Ann^r_M(N))$.

2 Modules with ACC on annihilators and Goldie Modules

The following definition was given in [4, Definition 3.1]. We include here this definition for the convenience of the reader.

Let $M \in R$-Mod. For a subset $X \subseteq End_R(M)$, let $\mathcal{A}_X = \cap \{\ker f \mid \ f \in X\}$. Now we consider the set $\mathcal{A}_M = \{\mathcal{A}_X \mid \ X \subseteq End_R(M)\ \}$.

Definition 2.1. Let $M \in R$-Mod, we say M satisfies ascending chain condition (ACC) on annihilators , if $\mathcal{A}_M$ satisfies ACC.

Notice that if $M = R$, then R satisfies ACC on annihilators in the sense of Definition 2.1, if and only if R satisfies ACC on left annihilators in the usual sense for a ring R.

Also note that if K is a submodule of M, we have that
$Ann_M(K) = \underset{f \in X}{\cap} \{\ker f \mid X = Hom_R(M, K)\}$.
Since $Hom_R(M, K) \subseteq End_R(M)$, then $Ann_M(K) = \mathcal{A}_X$,
where $X = Hom_R(M, K)$. Hence $Ann_M(K) \in \mathcal{A}_M$

Theorem 2.2. Let $M \in R$-Mod be projective in $\sigma[M]$ and a semiprime module. If M satisfies ACC on annihilators, then:

i) M has finitely many minimal of minimal prime in M submodules.

ii) If P_1, P_2, ..., P_n are the minimal prime in M submodules, then $P_1 \cap P_2 \cap$, ..., $\cap P_n = 0$

iii) If $P \subseteq M$ is prime in M, then P is minimal prime in M if and only if P is an annihilator submodule.

Proof. *i*) By a "prime annihilator " we mean a prime in M submodule which is an annihilator submodule. We shall first show that every annihilator submodule of M contains a finite product of annihilators primes in M. Suppose not, then by hypothesis there is an annihilator submodule N which is maximal with respect to not containing a finite product of annihilators primes in

M. Hence N is not prime in M. Thus by Remark 1.4 there are fully invariant submodules L and K of M such that $N \subsetneq L$, $N \subsetneq K$ and $L_M K \subseteq N$. Since $Ann_M(N)_M N = 0$, then by [3, Proposition 1.3] $Ann_M(N)_M(L_M K) = 0$. Since M is projective in $\sigma[M]$, then by [1, Proposition 5.6] we have that $(Ann_M(N)_M L)_M K = 0$. Therefore $K \subseteq Ann_M^r(Ann_M(N)_M L)$. Now we claim that $L_M[Ann_M^r(Ann_M(N)_M L)] \subseteq N$. We have that

$[Ann_M(N)_M L]_M[Ann_M^r(Ann_M(N)_M L)] = 0$. Newly as M is projective in $\sigma[M]$, then $Ann_M(N)_M(L_M[Ann_M^r(Ann_M(N)_M L)]) = 0$. Hence

$L_M[Ann_M^r(Ann_M(N)_M L)] \subseteq Ann_M^r(Ann_M(N))$. Since N is annihilator submodule, then by Lemma 1.7 and Proposition 1.18 we have that

$L_M[Ann_M^r(Ann_M(N)_M L)] \subseteq N$. Since $K \subseteq Ann_M^r(Ann_M(N)_M L) = Ann_M(Ann_M(N)_M L)$, then we can take $K = Ann_M(Ann_M(N)_M L)$. Thus K is an annihilator submodule. Similarly we can prove that

$L \subseteq Ann_M[K_M Ann_M^r(N)]$ and $(Ann_M[K_M Ann_M^r(N)])_M K \subseteq N$. So also we can take

$L = Ann_M[K_M Ann_M^r(N)]$. Hence L is an annihilator submodule. Therefore K and L are annihilator submodules such that $N \subsetneq K$, $N \subsetneq L$, and $L_M K \subseteq N$. So L and K contain a finite product of prime annihilators. Hence N contains a finite product of prime annihilator, this is a contradiction. Therefore every annihilator submodule of M contains a finite product of prime annihilators. Since $0 = Ann_M(M)$, then the zero is an annihilator submodule. Thus there are prime annihilators P_1, P_2, ..., P_n of M such that $(P_1)_M (P_2)_M$, ..., $P_n = 0$. Now if Q is a minimal prime in M, then $(P_1)_M (P_2)_M \ ... \ _M(P_n) = 0 \subseteq Q$. Thus there exists $P_j \subseteq Q$ for some $0 \leq j \leq n$. Whence $P_j = Q$. Therefore the minimal primes in M are contained in the finite set $\{P_1, P_2, ... , P_n\}$. Moreover each P_i is an annihilator submodule for $0 \leq i \leq n$.

ii) By *i*) we can suppose that P_1, P_2, ..., P_n are the minimal prime in M submodules. Now by [3 Proposition 1.3] we have that $[P_1 \cap P_2 \cap, ..., \cap P_n]^n \subseteq (P_1)_M (P_2)_M ...{}_M(P_n) = 0$. Since M is semiprime module, then by Lemma 1.6 we have that $P_1 \cap P_2 \cap, ..., \cap P_n = 0$

iii) Let $P \subseteq M$ be a prime in M submodule. If P is minimal prime in M,

then by $ii)$ we have that $P = P_j$ for some $1 \leq j \leq n$. By proof of $i)$ we know that each P_t is an annihilator submodule for $1 \leq t \leq n$. Hence P so does. Now we obtain the converse by By Lemma 1.13.

.

Notice that in Theorem 2.2 $i)$ we only use the condition M satisfies ACC on annihilator submodules. Also note that in $iii)$ each minimal prime P_i in M is an annihilator submodule. Thus $P_i = Ann_M(K)$ for some $K \subseteq \dot{M}$. As $K \in \mathbb{F}_{\chi(M)}$ and $Ann_M(K) = \cap\{\ker f \mid f \in Hom_R(M, K)\}$, then P_i is $\chi(M)$-pure in M for all $1 \leq i \leq n$.

Note that in Theorem 2.2 M satisfies ACC on annihilators is a necessary condition. In order to see this, consider de following example

Example 2.3. Let R a ring such that $\{S_i\}_{i\in I}$ is a family of non isomorphic simple R-modules and let $M = \bigoplus_{i\in I} S_i$. It is clear that M is projective in $\sigma[M]$. Now let $N \subseteq M$ such that $N_M N = 0$. Since M is semisimple module, then $N = 0$. Thus M is a semiprime module. We claim that M does not satisfy ACC on annihilators. In fact, let L be a submodule of M, then there exists K such that $M = K \oplus L$. So we can consider the canonical projection $\pi : M \to K$. Hence $\ker \pi = L$. Thus each submodule of M is the kernel of some morphism. Hence M does not satisfy ACC on annihilators. Now since $S_i \ncong S_j$, then S_i is minimal prime in M. So M has infinitely many minimal prime in M submodules.

Lemma 2.4. Let $M \in R$-Mod. If $C \in \sigma[M]$ is $\chi(M)$-cocritical, then there are submodules $C' \subseteq C$ and $M' \subseteq M$ such that C' is isomorphic to M'.

Proof. Since C is $\chi(M)$-cocritical, then $C \in \mathbb{F}_{\chi(M)}$. Thus $Hom_R\left(C,\ \widehat{M}\right) \neq 0$. So there exists $f : C \to \widehat{M}$ a non zero morphism. Since C is $\chi(M)$-cocritical and $M \subseteq_{ess} \widehat{M}$, then there exists C' submodule of C such that $C' \hookrightarrow M$. Hence there exists $M' \subseteq M$ such that $C' \cong M'$. Also note that M' is $\chi(M)$-cocritical.

Remark 2.5. If M is as in the Theorem 2.2 and $C \in \sigma[M]$ is $\chi(M)$-cocritical, then by Lemma 2.4 there are $C' \subseteq C$ and $M' \subseteq M$ such that $C' \cong$

M'. Hence M' is a uniform module, then by Proposition 1.11 we have that $Ann_M(M') = P$ where P is prime in M. By Lemma 2.13 P is minimal prime in M. Moreover by Remark 1.12 we have that $Ass_M(M') = \{P\}$. Hence $Ass_M(C') = \{P\}$. Since $C' \subseteq_{ess} C$, then by [3, Proposition 4.4] we obtain $Ass_M(C) = \{P\}$.

Let $Spec^{Min}(M)$ denote the set of minimal primes in M and $\mathcal{E}_\tau(M)$ a complete set of representatives of isomorphism classes of indecomposable τ-torsion free injective modules in $\sigma[M]$.

Also we denote by $\mathcal{P}_M^{Min} = \{\chi(M/P) \mid P \subseteq M \text{ is minimal prime in } M\}$.

Remark 2.6. Let τ_g be the hereditary torsion theory generated by the family of M-singular modules in $\sigma[M]$. If M is non M-singular, then $\tau_g = \chi(M)$. In fact, if M is non M-singular, then $\tau_g \leq \chi(M)$. Now if $\tau_g < \chi(M)$, then there exists $0 \neq N \in \mathbb{T}_{\chi(M)}$ such that $N \in \mathbb{F}_{\tau_g}$. Thus $Hom_R\left(N, \widehat{M}\right) = 0$. By [17, Proposition 10.2] N is M-singular. Thus $N \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau_g}$ a contradiction. So $\tau_g = \chi(M)$.

Theorem 2.7 . Let $M \in R$-Mod be projective in $\sigma[M]$ and semiprime module. If M satisfies ACC on annihilators and for each $0 \neq N \subseteq M$, N contains a uniform submodule, then there is a bijective correspondences between $\mathcal{E}_{\chi(M)}(M)$ and $Spec^{Min}(M)$.

Proof. Since M is semiprime and M satisfies ACC on annihilators then by [4, Proposition 3.4] we have that M is non M-singular. Thus by Remark 2.6 $\tau_g = \chi(M)$. Let $E \in \mathcal{E}_{\chi(M)}(M)$. As E is a uniform module and $E \in \mathbb{F}_{\chi(M)}$, then E is $\chi(M)$-cocritical. Now by Remark 2.5, we have that $Ass_M(E) = \{P\}$ with $P \in Spec^{Min}(M)$. Hence we define the function

$$\Psi : \mathcal{E}_{\chi(M)}(M) \to Spec^{Min}(M)$$

as $\Psi(E) = P$. We claim that Ψ is bijective. Suppose that $\Psi(E_1) = \Psi(E_2) = P$. Since E_1 and E_2 are uniform modules, then E_1 and E_2 are $\chi(M)$-cocritical.

Since $\tau_g = \chi(M)$, then by Lemma 2.4 there are $C_1' \subseteq E_1$, $C_2' \subseteq E_2$ and M_1, M_2 submodules of M such that $C_1' \cong M_1$ and $C_2' \cong M_2$. Hence M_1 and M_2 are uniform modules, then by Remark 1.12 we have that. $Ann_M(C_1') = Ann_M(M_1) = P = Ann_M(M_2) = Ann_M(C_2')$. So $Ann_M(M_1) = Ann_M(M_2) = P$.

On the other hand we have that $(M_1 + P)/P$ and $(M_2 + P)/P$ are submodules of M/P. By [3, Proposition 2.2 and 2.7] $\chi((M_1 + P)/P) = \chi(M/P) = \chi((M_2 + P)/P)$. Since $Ann_M(M_1) = Ann_M(M_2) = P$, then by Remark 1.8, $M_1 \cap P = 0$ and $M_2 \cap P = 0$. Therefore $(M_1 + P)/P \cong M_1/(P \cap M_1) = M_1$ and $(M_2 + P)/P \cong M_2/(P \cap M_1) = M_2$. Thus $\chi(M_1) = \chi(M/P) = \chi(M_2)$. So $Hom_R\left(M_1, \widehat{M_2}\right) \neq 0$. Since M_1 and M_2 are τ_g-cocritical, then there exists $N_1 \subseteq M_1$ such that $N_1 \hookrightarrow M_2$. As M_1 and M_2 are uniform modules, then $\widehat{M_1} \cong \widehat{N_1} \cong \widehat{M_2}$. Thus $E_1 = \widehat{C_1'} \cong \widehat{M_1} \cong \widehat{M_2} \cong \widehat{C_2'} = E_2$. So Ψ is injective.

Now let $P \in Spec^{Min}(M)$ since M satisfies ACC on annihilators, then by Theorem 2.2 $P = Ann_M(N)$ for some $0 \neq N \subseteq M$. By hypothesis there exists a uniform module U such that $U \subseteq N$. Thus $P = Ann_M(N) \subseteq Ann_M(U)$. By Proposition 1.11, we have that $Ann_M(U)$ is prime in M. As $Ann_M(U)$ is clearly an annihilator submodule, then by Theorem 2.2 *iii*) we have that $Ann_M(U)$ is minimal prime in M. Therefore $P = Ann_M(U)$. Furthermore by Remark 1.12 we have that $Ass_M(U) = \{P\}$. Hence $Ass_M\left(\widehat{U}\right) = \{P\}$ Thus $\Psi\left(\widehat{U}\right) = P$. As $U \subseteq M$, then $U \in F_{\chi(M)}$. Therefore $\widehat{U}$ is an indecomposable $\chi(M)$-torsion free injective module in $\sigma[M]$. Hence Ψ is surjective.

Notice that if P is prime in M such that P is $\chi(M)$-pure, then P is minimal prime in M. In fact by Proposition 1.10 there exists $P' \subseteq P$ such that P' is $\chi(M)$-pure and minimal prime in M. Now let N be a submodule of M such that $P \cap N = 0$, then $P_M N \subseteq P \cap N = 0$. So $P_M N \subseteq P'$. Thus $P \subseteq P'$or $N \subseteq P'$. Suppose that $P \nsubseteq P'$, then $N \subseteq P'$. Thus $N \subseteq P$. Hence $0 = P \cap N = N$. So $P \subseteq_{ess} M$. Thus $M/P \in \mathbb{T}_{\chi(M)}$ a contradiction. So $P \subseteq P'$. Thus $P = P'$. On the other hand , if $Spec_{\chi(M)}(M)$ denotes the set of $\chi(M)$-pure submodules prime in M, then $Spec^{Min}(M) = Spec_{\chi(M)}(M)$. So if M is as in the Theorem

2.7, then M has local Gabriel correspondence with respect to $\chi(M)$.

Example 2.8. Let $R = \mathbb{Z}_2 \rtimes (\mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2)$, the trivial extension of $\mathbb{Z}_2$ by $\mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2$. This ring can be described as $R = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & (x,y) \\ 0 & a \end{pmatrix} \mid a \in \mathbb{Z}_2, (x,y) \in \mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2 \right\}$. R has only one maximal ideal $I = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & (x,y) \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \mid (x,y) \in \mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2 \right\}$ and it has three simple ideals: J_1, J_2, J_3 which are isomorphic, where $J_1 = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & (0,0) \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & (1,0) \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\}$, $J_2 = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & (0,0) \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & (0,1) \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\}$, $J_3 = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & (0,0) \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & (1,1) \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\}$. Then the lattice of ideals of R has the following form



R is artinian and R-Mod has only one simple module up to isomorphism. Let S be the simple module. By [12, Theorem 2.13], we know that there is a lattice anti-isomorphism between the lattice of ideals of R and the lattice of fully invariant submodules of $E(S)$. Thus the lattice of fully invariant submodules of $E(S)$ has tree maximal elements K, L and N. Moreover, $E(S)$ contains only one simple module S. Therefore, the lattice of fully invariant submodules of $E(S)$ has the following form.



Let $M = E(S)$. As $K \cap L = S$ and $K_M L \subseteq K \cap L$, then $K_M L \subseteq S$. On the other hand, we consider the morphism. $f : M \overset{\pi}{\to} (M/N) \cong S \overset{i}{\hookrightarrow} L$, where π is the canonical projection and i is the inclusion. Thus $f(K) = S$. Therefore $S \subseteq K_M L$. Thus we have that $K_M L = S$. Thus $K_M L \subseteq N$ but $K \nsubseteq N$ and $L \nsubseteq N$. Therefore N is not prime in M. Analogously, we prove that neither K nor L are prime in M. Also we note that $K_M K = S$ and $S_M K = 0$. Thus $A_{nn_M}(K) = S$.

We claim that $K_M S = S$. In fact, if π is the natural projection from M onto M/N, then $\pi(K) = S$ since $(M/N) \cong S$. Thus $K_M S = S$. Analogously we prove that $L_M S = S$ and $N_M S = S$. Moreover, it is not difficult to prove that $A_{nn_M}(S) = K \cap L \cap N = S$ and that S is not a prime in M submodule. $Soc(R) = J_1 + J_2 + J_3 = J_1 \oplus J_2$ and $Soc(R) \subset_{ess} R$. As S is the only simple module, then $Soc(R) \cong S \oplus S$. So $E(S \oplus S) = E(R)$. Thus $E(R) = E(S) \oplus E(S) = M \oplus M$. Therefore $\sigma[M] = \sigma[R] = R\text{-}Mod$. Moreover $Hom_R(M, K) \neq 0$ for all $K \in \sigma[M]$ but M is not a generator of $\sigma[M]$.

Now let $0 \neq M'$ a submodule of M. As $S \subseteq_{ess} M$, then $S \subseteq M'$. Therefore every submodule of M contains a uniform submodule of M.

From the previous arguments we can conclude that:

1) $K_M(K_M K) = K_M S = S$ and $(K_M K)_M K = S_M K = 0$.

Thus $K_M(K_M K) \neq (K_M K)_M K$

2) M does not have prime in M submodules. Thus $Spec^{Min}(M) = \emptyset$

3) M is the only one indecomposable injective module in $\sigma[M]$. Thus $\mathcal{E}_{\chi(M)}(M) = \{M\}$

4) M is noetherian. So M satisfies ACC on annihilators

5) M is not projective in $\sigma[M]$

Remark 2.9. If M is projective in $\sigma[M]$ and we define the function $\Phi : Spec^{Min}(M) \to \mathcal{P}_M^{Min}$ as $\Phi(P) = \chi(M/P)$, then Φ is bijective. In fact. Let P and P' are minimal primes in M submodules, such that $\chi(M/P) = \chi(M/P')$, then P' is not $\chi(M/P)$-dense in M. As P' is fully invariant submodule of M, then by [3, Lemma 2.6] we obtain $P' \subseteq P$. But P is minimal prime in M, then $P' = P$. So Φ is injective. Moreover it is clear that Φ is surjective.

Corollary 2.10. Let $M \in R$-Mod be projective in $\sigma[M]$ and semiprime module. If M satisfies ACC on annihilators and for each $0 \neq N \subseteq M$, N contains a uniform submodule, then there is a bijective correspondence between $\mathcal{E}_{\chi(M)}(M)$ and $\mathcal{P}_M^{Min}$.

Proof. It follows from Theorem 2.7 and Remark 2.9.

Definition 2.11. An R-module M is Goldie Module if it satisfies ACC on annihilators and it has finite uniform dimension.

Notice that if $M = R$, then R is Goldie module in the sense of the definition 2.11 if and only if R is left Goldie ring.

Corollary 2.12. Let $M \in R$-Mod be projective in $\sigma[M]$ and a semiprime module. If M is a Goldie module, then there is a bijective correspondences between $\mathcal{E}_{\tau_g}(M)$ and $Spec^{Min}(M)$.

Proof. It follows from Definition 2.11 and Theorem 2.7.

Corollary 2.13. Let R be a semiprime ring such that satisfies ACC on left annihilators. Suppose that for each $0 \neq I \subseteq R$ left ideal of R, I contains a uniform left ideal of R, then there is a bijective correspondence between the set of representatives of isomorphism classes of indecomposable non singular injective R-modules and the set of minimal prime ideals of R.

Proof. From [3, Definition 1.10] we have that P is prime in R if and only if P is prime ideal of R. Since R is a semiprime ring and satisfies ACC on left annihilators, R is non singular

On the other hand we know that $\sigma[R] = R$-Mod. So by Theorem 2.7 we have the result.

Notice that the condition " for each non zero left ideal I of R, I contains a uniform left ideal of R " in the Corollary 2.13 is necessary. In order to see this, consider de following example

Example 2.14. Let R which is an Ore domain to the right but not to the left. See [15 p 53] for examples of rings of this sort. It is proved in [7, p 486] that

there are no $\chi(R)$-cocritical left R-modules. As R is a domain, then R is non singular. Thus $\chi(R) = \tau_g$. Moreover R is a prime ring and R clearly satisfies ACC on left annihilators. On the other hand we know that if U is a uniform τ_g-torsion free module, then U is τ_g-cocritical. But this is not possible. Thus there are no τ_g-torsion free uniform modules in R-mod. Hence $\mathcal{E}_{\tau_g}(R) = \emptyset$. As R is a domain, then $Spec^{Min}(R) = \{0\}$. Thus there are no bijective correspondence between $\mathcal{E}_{\tau_g}(R)$ and $Spec^{Min}(R)$.

Corollary 2.15. Let R be a semiprime left Goldie ring, then there is a bijective correspondence between a complete set of representatives of isomorphism classes of indecomposable non singular injective R-modules and the set of minimal prime ideals of R.

Proof. As R is a left Goldie ring, then R is a Goldie module. So by the Corollary 2.13 we have the result.

Notice that if R is as the Corollary 2.15, then by Theorem 2.7 and Corollary 2.13 $Spec_{\tau_g}(R) = \{I \mid I \text{ is a } \tau_g\text{-pure prime ideal of } R\} = Spec^{Min}(R)$. Thus R has local Gabriel correspondence with respec to $\chi(R) = \tau_g$

Lemma 2.16. Let $M \in R$-Mod be projective in $\sigma[M]$ and a semiprime module. Suppose that M satisfies ACC on annihilators. If P is a minimal prime in M and $Ann^r_M(P) = L$, then $P = Ann_M(L')$ for all $0 \neq L' \subseteq L$.

Proof. By Theorem 2.2, P is annihilator submodule, then by Proposition 1.18 we have that $P = Ann^r_M(Ann^r_M(P)) = Ann_M(L)$. Now let $0 \neq L' \subseteq L$ and $Ann_M(L') = K$. Thus $P = Ann_M(L) \subseteq Ann_M(L') = K$.

Suppose $P \subsetneq K$. As P is prime in M and $Ann_M(K)_M K = 0 \subseteq P$, then $Ann_M(K) \subseteq P$. So $Ann_M(K) \subseteq K$. Thus $Ann_M(K)_K Ann_M(K) \subseteq Ann_M(K)_M K = 0$. Since M is semiprime, then $Ann_M(K) = 0$. By Proposition 1.18 we have that $Ann_M(Ann_M(K)) = K$. But $Ann_M(Ann_M(K)) = Ann_M(0) = M$. Thus $M = K = Ann_M(L')$. So by Proposition 1.9 $L' = 0$ a contradiction. Therefore $P = K = Ann_M(L')$.

Note that if M is as in Lemma 2.16 and $Ann_M^r(P) = L$, then $Ass_M(L') = \{P\}$ for all $0 \neq L' \subseteq L$. Hence $\{P\} = Ass_M(N) = Ass_M\left(\widehat{L}\right)$ for all $0 \neq N \subseteq \widehat{L}$.

Proposition 2.17. Let $M \in R$-Mod be projective in $\sigma[M]$ and a semiprime module. Suppose that M satisfies ACC on annihilators. If $P_1, P_2, ..., P_n$ are the minimal primes in M, then $\{N_1, N_2, ...N_n\}$ is an independent family, where $N_i = Ann_M^r(P_i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$.

Proof. By induction. If $n = 1$, then we have the result. Suppose that $\{N_1, N_2, ...N_{n-1}\}$ is an independent family. If $(N_1 \oplus N_2 \oplus ... \oplus N_{n-1}) \cap N_n \neq 0$, then there are $x \in N_n$ and $1 \leq i \leq n-1$, such that $Rx \cong N_i' \subseteq N_i$. By Lemma 2.16 we have that $P_n = Ann_M^r(Rx) = Ann_M^r(N_i') = Ann_M^r(N_i) = P_i$ a contradiction. Therefore $(N_1 \oplus N_2 \oplus ... \oplus N_{n-1}) \cap N_n = 0$. So $\{N_1, N_2, ...N_n\}$ is a independent family.

Theorem 2.18. Let $M \in R$-Mod be projective in $\sigma[M]$ and a semiprime module. Suppose that M satisfies ACC on annihilators and for each $0 \neq N \subseteq M$, N contains a uniform submodule. If $P_1, P_2, ..., P_n$ are the minimal primes in M, then $\widehat{N_1} \oplus \widehat{N_2} \oplus ... \oplus \widehat{N_n} = \widehat{M}$ where $N_i = Ann_M^r(P_i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$.

Proof. By Proposition 2.17 we have that $\{N_1, N_2, ...N_n\}$ is an independent family. We claim that $N_1 \oplus N_2 \oplus ... \oplus N_n \subseteq_{ess} M$. In fact let $0 \neq L \subseteq M$. By hypothesis there exists U a uniform module shut that $U \subseteq L$. By Proposition 1.11 and Theorem 2.2 we have that $Ann_M(U)$ is minimal prime in M. So $Ann_M(U) = P_j$ for some $1 \leq j \leq n$. Hence $(P_j)_M U = 0$. Thus $U \subseteq Ann_M^r(P_j) = N_j$. Whence $(N_1 \oplus N_2 \oplus ... \oplus N_n) \cap L \neq 0$. Therefore $\widehat{N_1} \oplus \widehat{N_2} \oplus ... \oplus \widehat{N_n} = \widehat{M}$.

Corollary 2.19. Let $M \in R$-Mod be projective in $\sigma[M]$ and a semiprime module. Suppose that M is Goldie Module and $P_1, P_2, ..., P_n$ are the minimal primes in M, then $\widehat{N_1} \oplus \widehat{N_2} \oplus ... \oplus \widehat{N_n} = \widehat{M}$ where $N_i = Ann_M^r(P_i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$.

Proof. As M is Goldie module, then M has finite uniform dimension and M satisfies ACC on annihilators. So by the Theorem 2.18 we have the result.

Theorem 2.20. Let $M \in R$-Mod be projective in $\sigma[M]$ and a semiprime module. Suppose that M is Goldie Module and $P_1, P_2, ..., P_n$ are the minimal primes in M submodules. If $N_i = Ann_M^r(P_i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$, then there exists E_1, E_2, ... , E_n uniform injective modules such that $\widehat{M} \cong E_1^{k_1} \oplus E_2^{k_2} \oplus ... \oplus E_n^{k_n}$ and $Ass_M(E_i) = \{P_i\}$.

Proof. Since N_i has finite uniform dimension, then there are U_{i_1}, U_{i_2}, ... , $U_{i_{k_i}}$ uniform submodules of N_i, such that $U_{i_1} \oplus U_{i_2} \oplus ... \oplus U_{i_{k_i}} \subseteq_{ess} N_i$. Thus $\widehat{U_{i_1}} \oplus \widehat{U_{i_2}} \oplus ... \oplus \widehat{U_{i_{k_i}}} = \widehat{N_i}$. Now by Lemma 2.16, we have that $Ann_M\left(U_{i_j}\right) = P_i$ for all $1 \leq j \leq k_i$. Thus $Ass_M\left(U_{i_j}\right) = Ass_M\left(\widehat{U_{i_j}}\right) = \{P_i\}$ for all $1 \leq j \leq k_i$. Hence by Theorem 2.7, we have that $\widehat{U_{i_1}} \cong \widehat{U_{i_2}} \cong .... \cong \widehat{U_{i_{k_i}}}$. So we can denote $E_i = \widehat{U_{i_1}}$. Hence $\widehat{N_i} \cong E_i^{k_i}$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. Therefore by Theorem 2.18 we have that $\widehat{M} \cong E_1^{k_1} \oplus E_2^{k_2} \oplus ... \oplus E_n^{k_n}$.

Notice that by Theorem 2.2 $E_i \ncong E_j$ for $i \neq j$.

Proposition 2.21. Let $M \in R$-Mod be projective in $\sigma[M]$ and a semiprime module. Suppose that M is a Goldie Module and $P_1, P_2, ..., P_n$ are the minimal primes in M, then $\widehat{N_i}$ is a fully invariant submodule of $\widehat{M}$ where $N_i = Ann_M^r(P_i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$.

Proof. We claim that if $i \neq j$, then $Hom_R\left(\widehat{N_i},\ \widehat{N_j}\right) = 0$. In fact by Theorem 2.20 we have that $\widehat{U_{i_1}} \oplus \widehat{U_{i_2}} \oplus ... \oplus \widehat{U_{i_{k_i}}} = \widehat{N_i}$ where U_{i_1}, U_{i_2}, ... , $U_{i_{k_i}}$ are uniform submodules of N_i analogously $\widehat{U_{j_1}} \oplus \widehat{U_{j_2}} \oplus ... \oplus \widehat{U_{j_{k_j}}} = \widehat{N_j}$ where U_{j_1}, $U_{i_{j2}}$, ... , $U_{j_{k_j}}$ are uniform submodules of N_j. Let $0 \neq f \in Hom_R\left(\widehat{N_i},\ \widehat{N_j}\right)$, then there exist i_r and j_t such that the restriction morphism. $f_{|\widehat{U_{i_r}}} : \widehat{U_{i_r}} \to \widehat{U_{j_t}}$ is non zero. By [4, Proposition 3.4] M is non M-singular. Hence $\widehat{M}$ is non M-singular. Since $\widehat{U_{i_r}}$ is uniform submodule of $\widehat{M}$, then $f_{|\widehat{U_{i_r}}}$ is a monomorphism. So $Ass_M\left(\widehat{U_{i_r}}\right) = Ass_M\left(\widehat{U_{j_t}}\right)$. But $Ass_M\left(\widehat{U_{i_r}}\right) = Ass_M\left(\widehat{N_i}\right) = P_i$ and

$Ass_M\left(\widehat{U_{j_t}}\right) = Ass_M\left(\widehat{N_j}\right) = P_j$ a contradiction. Therefore $Hom_R\left(\widehat{N_i},\ \widehat{N_j}\right) = 0$. Now let $g : \widehat{M} \to \widehat{M}$ be a morphism. By Theorem 2.18 we have $g\left(\widehat{N_i}\right) \subseteq \widehat{N_1} \oplus \widehat{N_2} \oplus ... \oplus \widehat{N_n}$. Since $Hom_R\left(\widehat{N_i},\ \widehat{N_j}\right) = 0$ for $i \neq j$, then $g\left(\widehat{N_i}\right) \subseteq \widehat{N_i}$. Thus $\widehat{N_i}$ is a fully invariant submodule of $\widehat{M}$.

Proposition 2.22. Let $M \in R$-Mod be projective in $\sigma[M]$ and a semiprime module. Suppose that M satisfies ACC on annihilators and for each $0 \neq N \subseteq M$, N contains a uniform submodule. If $P_1, P_2, ..., P_n$ are the minimal primes in M and $N_i = Ann_M^r(P_i)$ has finite uniform dimension for each $1 \leq i \leq n$, then M has finite uniform dimension.

Proof. By Theorem 2.18 we obtain that $N_1 \oplus N_2 \oplus ... \oplus N_n \subseteq_{ess} M$. Now since N_i has finite uniform dimension for each $1 \leq i \leq n$, then M has finite uniform dimension.

Theorem 2.23. Let $M \in R$-Mod be projective in $\sigma[M]$ and a semiprime module. Suppose that M satisfies ACC on annihilators and for each $0 \neq N \subseteq M$, N contains a uniform submodule. If $P_1, P_2, ..., P_n$ are the minimal primes in M then the following conditions are equivalent.

i) M is a Goldie Module.

ii) $N_i = Ann_M^r(P_i)$ has finite uniform dimension for each $1 \leq i \leq n$.

Proof *i*) $\Rightarrow$ *ii*) As M is left Goldie module, then M has finite uniform dimension. Hence we have the result.

ii) $\Rightarrow$ *i*) By Proposition 2.22 we have that M has finite uniform dimension. Thus M is left Goldie module.

Corollary 2.24. Let R be a semiprime ring such that R satisfies ACC on left annihilators. Suppose that for each non zero left ideal $I \subseteq R$, I contains a uniform left ideal. If $P_1, P_2, ..., P_n$ are the minimal prime ideals of R, then the following conditions are equivalent.

i) R is a left Goldie ring.

ii) $Ann_R(P_i) = N_i$ has finite uniform dimension for each $1 \leq i \leq n$.

Proof. It follows from Theorem 2.23

Lemma 2.25. Let $M \in R$-Mod be projective in $\sigma[M]$ and a semiprime module. Suppose that M satisfies ACC on annihilators. If $P_1, P_2, ..., P_n$ are the minimal primes in M, then $Ann^r_M(P_i) = \underset{i \neq j}{\cap} P_j$ for every $1 \leq i \leq n$.

Proof. As each P_i is a fully invariant submodule of M, then $(P_i)_M \left(\underset{i \neq j}{\cap} P_j \right) \subseteq P_i \cap \left(\underset{i \neq j}{\cap} P_j \right) = \cap_{j=1}^n P_j$. By Theorem 2.2 we have that $\cap_{j=1}^n P_j = 0$. Thus $(P_i)_M \left(\underset{i \neq j}{\cap} P_j \right) = 0$. So $\underset{i \neq j}{\cap} P_j \subseteq Ann^r_M(P_i)$. Now let $K \subseteq M$ such that $(P_i)_M K = 0$, then $(P_i)_M K \subseteq P_j$ for all $i \neq j$. As P_j is prime in M, then $P_i \subseteq P_j$ or $K \subseteq P_j$. But $P_i \subseteq P_j$ is not possible. Thus $K \subseteq P_j$ for all $j \neq i$. Hence $K \subseteq \underset{i \neq j}{\cap} P_j$. Thus $Ann^r_M(P_i) = \underset{i \neq j}{\cap} P_j$

Notice that by Proposition 1.16 we have that $Ann_M(P_i) = Ann^r_M(P_i)$. Thus $Ann_M(P_i) = \underset{i \neq j}{\cap} P_j$ for every $1 \leq i \leq n$.

Corollary 2.26. Let $M \in R$-Mod be projective in $\sigma[M]$ and a semiprime module. Suppose that M satisfies ACC on annihilators and for each $0 \neq N \subseteq M$, N contains a uniform submodule. If $P_1, P_2, ..., P_n$ are the minimal primes in M and P_i has finite uniform dimension for each $1 \leq i \leq n$, then M has finite uniform dimension.

Proof. By Lemma 2.25 $Ann^r_M(P_i) = \underset{i \neq j}{\cap} P_j$. Hence $Ann^r_M(P_i)$ has finite uniform dimension. So by Proposition 2.23 we have that M has finite uniform dimension.

Theorem 2.27. Let R be a semiprime ring such that R satisfies ACC on left annihilators. Suppose that for each non zero left ideal $I \subseteq R$, I contains a uniform left ideal. If $P_1, P_2, ..., P_n$ are the minimal prime ideals of R, then the following conditions are equivalent.

i) R is left Goldie ring.

ii) P_i has finite uniform dimension for each $1 \leq i \leq n$.

Proof. *i*) $\Rightarrow$ *ii*) It is clear.

ii) $\Rightarrow$ *i*) By Corollary 2.26 we have that R has finite uniform dimension. So R is left Goldie ring.

Finally we obtain the following result which extends the result given in [Bo Stemtrom Lemma 2.5]

Definition 2.28. Let $M \in R$-Mod. We say that a submodule N of M is a nilpotent submodule if $N^k = 0$ for some positive integer k.

Proposition 2.29. Let M be projective in $\sigma[M]$. If M satisfies ACC on annihilators, then $\mathcal{Z}(M)$ is a nilpotent submodule.

Proof. We consider the descending chain $\mathcal{Z}(M) \supseteq \mathcal{Z}(M)^2 \supseteq ....$We suppose that $\mathcal{Z}(M)^n \neq 0$ for all $n \geq 1$.So we have the ascending chain $Ann_M(\mathcal{Z}(M)) \subseteq$

$Ann_M\left(\mathcal{Z}(M)^2\right) \subseteq ...$Since M satisfies ACC on annihilators, there exists $n > 0$ such that $Ann_M(\mathcal{Z}(M)^n) = Ann_M\left(\mathcal{Z}(M)^{n+1}\right) = ...$

As $\mathcal{Z}(M)^{n+2} \neq 0$, then by [1, Proposition 5.6] we have that $[\mathcal{Z}(M)_M \mathcal{Z}(M)]_M \mathcal{Z}(M)^n \neq 0$.

Since $\mathcal{Z}(M)_M \mathcal{Z}(M) = \sum \{f(\mathcal{Z}(M)) \mid f : M \to \mathcal{Z}(M)\ \}$, then

$[\sum \{f(\mathcal{Z}(M)) \mid f : M \to \mathcal{Z}(M)\ \}]_M \mathcal{Z}(M)^n \neq 0$. So by [3, Proposition1.3] there exits $f : M \to \mathcal{Z}(M)$ such that $f(\mathcal{Z}(M))_M \mathcal{Z}(M)^n \neq 0$. Thus $f(M)_M \mathcal{Z}(M)^n \neq 0$

Now consider the set

$$\Gamma = \{\ker f \mid f : M \to \mathcal{Z}(M) \text{ and } f(M)_M \mathcal{Z}(M)^n \neq 0\}$$

By hypothesis Γ has maximal elements. Let $f : M \to \mathcal{Z}(M)$ such that $\ker f$ is a maximal element in Γ.

We claim that $h(f(M))_M \mathcal{Z}(M)^n = 0$ for all $h : M \to \mathcal{Z}(M)$. In fact let $h : M \to \mathcal{Z}(M)$ be a morphism. By [5, Lemma 2.7] $\ker h \subseteq_{ess} M$. So $\ker h \cap f(M) \neq 0$. Thus there exists $0 \neq f(m)$ such that $h(f(m)) = 0$. So $\ker f \subsetneq \ker h \circ f$. If $h(f(M))_M \mathcal{Z}(M)^n \neq 0$, then $h \circ f \in \Gamma$. But $\ker f$ is a maximal element in Γ and $\ker f \subsetneq \ker h \circ f$, then $h \circ f \notin \Gamma$ a contradiction. Therefore $h(f(M))_M \mathcal{Z}(M)^n = 0$.

On the other hand by [1, Proposition 5.6] we have that .

$f(M)_M \mathcal{Z}(M)^{n+1} = [f(M)_M \mathcal{Z}(M)]_M \mathcal{Z}(M)^n =$

$[\sum \{h(f(M)) \mid h : M \to \mathcal{Z}(M)\}]_M \mathcal{Z}(M)^n$. By [3, Proposition 1.3] we have that $[\sum \{h(f(M)) \mid h : M \to \mathcal{Z}(M)\}]_M \mathcal{Z}(M)^n =$

$\sum \{h(f(M))_M \mathcal{Z}(M)^n \mid h : M \to \mathcal{Z}(M)\} = 0.$

Thus $f(M)_M \mathcal{Z}(M)^{n+1} = 0$.

Hence $f(M) \subseteq Ann_M\left(\mathcal{Z}(M)^{n+1}\right) = Ann_M(\mathcal{Z}(M)^n)$. So $f(M)_M \mathcal{Z}(M)^n = 0$ a contradiction.

Corollary 2.30. Let $M \in R$- Mod be projective in $\sigma[M]$ and $S = End_R(M)$. If M is retractable and satisfies ACC on annihilators, then $\mathcal{Z}_r(S)$ is nilpotent. Where $\mathcal{Z}_r(S)$ is the right singular ideal of S.

Proof. Notice that if, N and L are submodules of M then,

$Hom_R(M, L) Hom_R(M, N) \subseteq Hom_R(M, N_M L)$. Now we consider the ideal $\Delta = \{f \in S \mid \ker f \subseteq_{ess} M\}$. We claim that $\mathcal{Z}_r(S) \subseteq \Delta$, in fact let $\alpha \in \mathcal{Z}_r(S)$, then there exists I essential right deal of S such that $\alpha I = 0$. Thus $\alpha \circ g = 0$ for all $g \in I$. Hence $\alpha\left(\sum_{g \in I} g(M)\right) = 0$. Now let $0 \neq N \subseteq M$. As M is retractable, then there exits $\rho : M \to N$ a non zero morphism. Thus $\rho S \cap I \neq 0$. So there exists $h \in S$ such that $0 \neq \rho \circ h \in I$. Hence $0 \neq (\rho \circ h)(M) \subseteq N \cap \sum_{g \in I} g(M)$. Thus $\sum_{g \in I} g(M) \subseteq_{ess} M$. So $\ker \alpha \subseteq_{ess} M$. Hence $\mathcal{Z}_r(S) \subseteq \Delta$. So $\mathcal{Z}_r(S) M \subseteq \Delta M \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(M)$. Moreover $Hom_R(M, \Delta M) \subseteq (M, \mathcal{Z}(M))$. On the other hand we have that $\Delta \subseteq Hom_R(M, \Delta M)$. By Proposition 2.29 there exists $n > 0$ such that $\mathcal{Z}(M)^n = 0$. Thus $\Delta^n \subseteq Hom_R(M, \Delta M)^n \subseteq (M, \mathcal{Z}(M))^n \subseteq (M, \mathcal{Z}(M)^n) = 0$. So Δ is nilpotent. Since $\mathcal{Z}_r(S) \subseteq \Delta$, then $\mathcal{Z}_r(S)$ is nilpotent.

In the Corollary 2.30 we have that Δ is nilpotent. Notice that to obtain this resul it is not necessary the condition M is retractable.

Corollary 2.31. Let $M \in R$- Mod be projective in $\sigma[M]$ and $S = End_R(M)$. If I is an ideal of S such that $\cap_{f\in I} \ker f \subseteq_{ess} M$, then I is nilpotent.

Proof. As $\cap_{f\in I} \ker f \subseteq_{ess} M$, then $\ker f \subseteq_{ess} M$ for all $f \in I$. Thus $I \subseteq \Delta$. By Corollary 2.30 we have that Δ is nilpotent. So I is nilpotent

Definition 2.32. Let $M \in R$. A submodule N of M is T_M-nilpotent in case every sequence $\{f_1, f_2, ..., f_n, ...\}$ in $Hom_R(M, N)$ and any $a \in N$, there exists $n \geq 1$ such that $f_n f_{n-1} ... f_1(a) = 0$.

Notice that if I is a left ideal of a ring R, then I is left T-nilpotent in the usual sense if and only if I is T_R-nilpotente.

Proposition 2.33. Let $M \in R$- Mod be projective in $\sigma[M]$ and retractable. Suppose that M satisfies ACC on annihilators. If $N \subseteq M$ is T_M-nilpotent, then N is nilpotent.

Proof. Let $N \subseteq M$ be T_M-nilpotent. Consider the chain $N \supseteq N^2 \supseteq N^3 \supseteq$ .... Then we have the chain $Ann_M(N) \subseteq Ann_M(N^2) \subseteq Ann_M(N^3) \subseteq$ .... Since M satisfies ACC on annihilators, then there exists $k \geq 1$ such that $Ann_M(N^K) = Ann_M(N^{k+1}) = Ann_M(N^{k+2})$ ..... Let $L = N^k$. If $L^2 = L_M L \neq 0$, then there exists $f : M \to L$ and $a \in L \subseteq N$ such that $f(a) \neq 0$. Hence $(Ra)_M L \neq 0$. If $(Ra)_M (L_M L) = 0$, then $Ra \subseteq Ann_M(L^2) = Ann_M(L)$. So $Ra_M L = 0$ a contradiction. Thus $(Ra)_M (L_M L) \neq 0$. By [1, M-injective 5.6] $0 \neq (Ra)_M (L_M L) = ((Ra)_M L)_M L$. As $(Ra)_M L = \sum \{f(Ra) \mid f : M \to L\}$, then by [3, Proposition 1.3] there exists $f_1 : M \to L$ such that $f_1 (Ra)_M L \neq 0$. So $(Rf_1(a))_M L \neq 0$. Newly $(Rf_1(a))_M (L_M L) \neq 0$. Hence $(Rf_1(a)_M L)_M L \neq 0$. So there exists $f_2 : M \to L$ such that $f_2 (Rf_1(a))_M L \neq 0$. Hence $Rf_2 (f_1(a))_M L \neq 0$. Continuing in this way, we have that $Rf_n.f_{n-1}...f_1(a)_M L \neq 0$ for all $n \geq 1$. Hence $f_n.f_{n-1}...f_1(a) \neq 0$ for all $n \geq 1$ a contradiction because N is T_M-nilpotent. Hence $L^2 = 0$. So N is nilpotent.

3 Continuous Modules with ACC on annihilators

The following definitions were given in [14]. We include here these definitions for convenience of the reader.

Definition 3.1. Let $M \in R$-Mod. M is called continuous module if it satisfies the followings conditions:

C_1) Every submodule of M is essential in a direct summand of M

C_2) Every submodule of M that is isomorphic to a direct summand of M is itself a direct summand.

Definition 3.2. An R-module M is $\mathcal{K}$-nonsingular if for every $f \in End_R(M)$ such that $\ker f \subseteq_{ess} M$ implies $f = 0$.

Notice that by [14, Proposition 2.3] we have that if M is non M-singular module, then M is $\mathcal{K}$-nonsingular

Definition 3.3. Let $M \in R$-Mod. The $\mathcal{K}$-singular submodule of M is defined as $Z^{\mathcal{K}}(M) = \sum \{f(M) \mid f \in End_R(M) \text{ and } \ker f \subseteq_{ess} M\}$

Remark 3.4. If M is a continuous module and $S = End_R(M)$, then by [10, Proposition 1.25] we have that $J(S) = \{f \in S \mid \ker f \subseteq_{ess} M\}$. Hence $Z^{\mathcal{K}}(M) = J(S)M$. On the other hand it is clear that $Z^{\mathcal{K}}(M) \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(M)$. Therefore $J(S)M \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(M)$.

Proposition 3.5. Let $M \in R$- Mod be projective in $\sigma[M]$ and $S = End_R(M)$. Suppose that M is a continuous module . If M satisfies ACC on annihilators, then $J(S)$ is nilpotent

Proof. As M is a continuous module, then by Remark 3.4 we have that $J(S) = \{f \in S \mid \ker f \subseteq_{ess} M\}$. By Corollary 2.30 $J(S) = \Delta$ is nilpotent.

Theorem 3.6. Let $M \in R$- Mod be projective in $\sigma[M]$ and $S = End_R(M)$. Suppose that M is a continuous, retractable, non M-singular module and satisfies ACC on annihilators. Then M is a semiprime Goldie module.

Proof. Since M is non M-singular and continuous, then by Remark 3.4. $J(S)M = 0$. Hence $J(S) = 0$. Thus S is a semiprime ring. We claim that M is semiprime module. In fact let L be a fully invariant submodule of M such that $L^2 = L_M L = 0$. As $Hom_R(M, L)\, Hom_R(M, L) \subseteq Hom_R(M, L_m L)$, then $Hom_R(M, L)\, Hom_R(M, L) = 0$. Since S is semiprime ring the $Hom_R(M, L) = 0$. Now as M is retractable, then $L = 0$. Since M is non M-singular, then M is $\mathcal{K}$-nonsingular, then by [14, Proposition 3.1, Corollary 3.3 and Theorem 1.5] we have that $\ker f$ is a direct summand of M for all $f \in S$. As satisfies ACC on annihilators, then M satisfies ACC on direct summands. Since M satisfies the condition C_1, then every closed submodule of M is a direct summand . Thus M satisfies ACC on closed submodules. By [9, Proposition 6.30] M has finite uniform dimension. Hence M is a semiprime Goldie module.

Corollary 3.7. Let R be a continuous and non singular ring. Suppose that R satisfies ACC on left annihilators, then R is a semiprime left Goldie ring.

Notice that in the Corollary 3.7 the inverse is not true in general. Consider the following example

Example 3.8. Let $R = \mathbb{Z}$ be the ring of integers. We know $\mathbb{Z}$ is a prime Goldie ring, but $\mathbb{Z}$ is not a continuous ring.

References

[1] Beachy, J. (2002). M-injective modules and prime M-ideals, *Comm. Algebra* 30(10):4639-4676.

[2] Bican, L., Jambor, P., Kepka, T., Nemec, P. (1980). Prime and coprime modules, *Fundamenta Matematicae* 107:33-44

[3] Castro, J., Ríos, J. (2012). Prime submodules and local Gabriel correspondence in $\sigma[M]$, *Comm. Algebra.* 40(1):213-232.

[4] Castro, J., Ríos, J. (2014). Krull dimension and classical Krull dimension of modules. *Comm. Algebra.* 42(7):3183-3204

[5] Castro, J., Ríos, J. (2015). M tame modules and Gabriel correpondence, *to appear in Comm. Algebra.*

[6] Chatters, A. , Hajarnavis, C. (1980) Rings with chain conditions, Boston, London, Melbourne: Pitman Advanced Publishing Program

[7] Golan, J. (1986). Torsion Theories, Longman Scientific & Technical, Harlow.

[8] Goodearl, K, Warfield, R (2004). An introduction to Noncommutative Noetherian Rings, Cambridge University Press.

[9] Lam, T. (1998), Lectures on Modules and Rings, Graduate Texts in Mathematics., vol 139, New York: Springer-Verlag.

[10] Nicholson, W. Yousif, M. (2003). Quasi-Frobenius Rings. Cambridge University Press.

[11] Raggi, F., Rios, J., Rincón, H., Fernández-Alonso, R., Signoret, C. (2005). Prime and irreducible preradicals, *J. Algebra Appl.* 4(4):451-466.

[12] Raggi, F., Ríos, J., Rincón, H., Fernández-Alonso, R. (2009). Basic Preradicals and Main Injective Modules, *J. Algebra Appl.* 8(1):1-16.

[13] Raggi, F., Ríos, J., Rincón, H., Fernández-Alonso, R. (2009). Semiprime Preradicals, *Comm. Algebra.* 37(7):2811-2822.

[14] Rizvi, S., Roman, C. (2007). On K-nonsigular Modules and Applications. *Comm. Algebra.* 35:2960-2982..

[15] Stenström, B. (1975). Rings of Quotients, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, New York: Springer-Verlag.

[16] Wisbauer, R. (1991). Foundations of Module and Ring Theory, Gordon and Breach: Reading.

[17] Wisbauer, R.(1996). Modules and Algebras: Bimodule Structure and Group Actions on Algebras, England: Addison Wesley Longman Limited.